

REMARKS

The Application presently includes claims 23-52. Claims 1-6 and 9-22 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-6 and 9-22 are cancelled by the present amendment. New claims 23-52 have been added. The Examiner objects to the content of the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections and rejections and pass the application to allowance.

Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner objects to the content of the Abstract for failing to be a concise statement of the technical disclosure. Applicant has amended the Abstract to comply with USPTO guidelines. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections.

Claim Rejections under U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph of Claims 1-6 and 9-22

The rejection of claims 1- 6 and 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, as applied to new claims 23-52, is respectfully overcome by the new claims.

1. The Examiner's Rejection of Claim 1

The Examiner rejects claim 1 for the following reasons:

At line 2, "what is being defined by 'or the like'? It is not understood as to what the rigid plates are made of if not 'plasticised wood' or 'rigid plastic'. What, for that matter, is being defined by 'plasticised wood'?"

At line 7, "'the perfect cylinder' lacks an antecedent basis within the claim."

At line 6, "what is being defined by '... having a reduced width'? With respect to what is the width reduced?"

At lines 6-7, "it is not, at all, clear as to what is being defined by 'more reduced

Application No. 09/913,703

when greater is the degree of proximity of the formwork to the perfect cylinder’.

At line 8, “recitation of ‘with the help of the external envelope’ is not clear. What is the particular relationship between the ‘laminates’ and the ‘external envelope’?”

Claim 1 is cancelled by the present amendment. The subject matter of original claim 1 is presented in new claims 23, 26, and 29. With respect to the language at issue in line 2, the language has been removed from the new claims. Regarding the term “plasticised wood,” the inventor is referring to wood that has a plasticised surface. Untreated wood has a pitted texture and pores that affect the texture of the resulting concrete. The term “plasticised wood” is understood to have this meaning in the industry, as further evidenced by U.S. Patent 6,260,816, issued to the same inventor as the present Applicant, as being wood like Medium Density Fiberboard (MDF). See 6,260,816, column 2, lines 19-21. Regarding the term “rigid plastic,” Applicant is referring to plastic that is relatively rigid and not flexible, as it well understood in the industry.

With respect to the language at issue in lines 6 and 7, any potential antecedent basis problems have been removed in the new claims. Regarding the definition of “a perfect cylinder,” Applicant is referring to a cylinder as defined and understood by the geometry term “cylinder”, that is a body having a circular cross section and a specified length. In new claims 23-37, the formwork of the claimed embodiment is made from a plurality plates. The inner surface of these plates is flat and when joined do not make a perfect cylinder, but only approximate a perfect cylinder. As the width of the plates gets smaller, the number of plates in the formwork can be increased. The greater the number of plates increases the degree of approximation, or proximity, to the perfect cylinder.

With respect to the language at issue in line 8, the new claim 23 establishes the external envelope of the formwork as an element of the claimed invention.

2. The Examiner's Rejection of Claim 2

The Examiner rejects claim 2, stating, "Claim 2 appears to present only optional language, (e.g., only a possible arrangement)." Claim 2 is cancelled by the present amendment. The subject matter of original claim 2 is currently presented in new claim 32. New claim 32 is written so as to eliminate any optional language and to further limit new independent claim 23.

3. The Examiner's Rejection of Claim 3

The Examiner rejects claim 3, stating that claim 3 "appears to present only optional language." Claim 3 is canceled by the present amendment. The subject matter of original claim 3 is currently presented in new claim 35. New claim 35 is written so as to eliminate any optional language and to further limit new independent claim 23.

4. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 4-6, 12-14, and 18-20

The Examiner rejects claims 4-6, 12-14 and 18-20, stating that they appear to improperly set forth an embodiment not commensurate in scope with any of the embodiments of the invention described in the specification. Claims 4-6, 12-14, and 18-20 are cancelled by the present amendment. The subject matter of original claims 4 is currently present in new independent claim 38 and new dependent claims 41 and 44. The subject matter of original claims 5 and 6 is currently presented in new claims 47 and 50 respectively. New independent claim 38 and new dependant claims 47 and 50 claim an embodiment of the present invention described in the specification at page 6, line 21 through page 7, line 14.

The subject matter of claims 12-14 and 18-20 are currently present in new claims 39-40, 42-43, 45-46, 48-49, and 51-52. The subject matter of these claims was originally presented in claims 7 and 8, which were cancelled by Preliminary Amendment A. Preliminary Amendment A was submitted merely as a matter of form, and for the sole purpose of eliminating unnecessary multiple dependant claims and adding regular dependent claims in their place for convenience in reviewing the claims and reducing the filing fee. New claims 39-40, 42-43, 45-46, 48-49, and 51-52 present the subject matter of previously cancelled claims 7 and 8 and presently cancelled

Application No. 09/913,703

12-14 and 18-20, in rewritten form so as to remove any ambiguity in the claim language and to properly depend from the new claims.

5. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 21, and 22 (as well as claims 12-14 and 18-20)

The Examiner rejects claims 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 21 and 22 (as well as claims 12-14 and 18-20) for the following reasons:

In claims 9, 10, and 11, at lines 1-3, "What is being defined by 'it is included' or 'as an outer stiffening envelope'?"

In claims 9, 10, and 11, at line 3, "'said band' lacks an antecedent basis."

In claims 9, 10, and 11, at lines 3-4, "What exactly is 'the rest of the structure of the formwork'?"

In claims 9, 10, and 11, at line 4, "To what does 'it' refer?"

In claims 9, 10, and 11, lines 4-6 are not understood at all.

In claims 15, 16, 17, 21, and 22, at line 1, "'said self-adhesive tape' lacks an antecedent within the claim."

In claims 15, 16, 17, 21, and 22, at line 2, "What is being defined by 'or the like'?"

In claims 15, 17, 17, 21, and 22 (as well as claims 12-14 and 18-20) appear to improperly set forth and define an embodiment not commensurate in scope with any of the embodiments of the invention described within the specification..

The present amendment cancels claims 9-22. Cancelled claims 9-22 presented subject matter that was originally presented in original claims 7 and 8. As discussed above, original claims 7 and 8 were cancelled in Preliminary Amendment A. Preliminary Amendment A was submitted merely as a matter of form, and for the sole purpose of eliminating unnecessary multiple dependent claims and adding regular dependent claims in their place for convenience in reviewing the claims and reducing the filing fee. New claims 24-25, 27-28, 30-31, 33-34, 36-37, 39-40, 42-43, 45-46, 48-49, and 51-52 present the subject matter of previously cancelled claims 7

Application No. 09/913,703

and 8 and presently cancelled 9-22, in rewritten form so as to remove any ambiguity in the claim language and to properly depend from the new claims.

Particularly, the language cited by the examiner has been removed and possible antecedent basis issues have been clarified. The support for the subject matter claimed in new claims 24-25, 27-28, 30-31, 33-34, 36-37, 39-40, 42-43, 45-46, 48-49, and 51-52 is located in the original specification at page 7, lines 23-37.

Conclusion

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and seeks early indication of the same. If the Examiner requires further information with respect to this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at (847) 537-3537 for a telephonic interview.

Respectfully submitted,


Date: January 2, 2004

By: 

Marc D. Machtinger, Reg. No. 43,434
Law Office of Marc D. Machtinger, Ltd.
750 W. Lake Cook Road, Suite 350
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089
Phone: (847) 537-3537
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 30358

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 2, 2004 by:


Marc D. Machtinger, Reg. No. 43,434